



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

O'SHEA GETZ & KOSAKOWSKI, P.C.
1500 MAIN ST., SUITE 912
SPRINGFIELD, MA 01115

COPY MAILED

FEB 16 2007

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of	:	
Bernhard Albicker	:	
Application No. 09/758,552	:	DECISION ON PETITION
Filed: January 11, 2001	:	UNDER 37 CFR 1.137(b)
Attorney Docket No: WESTPHAL.6030	:	

This is a decision on the petition, filed December 11, 2006, which is being treated as a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) to revive the instant nonprovisional application for failure to timely notify the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) of the filing of an application in a foreign country, or under a multinational treaty that requires publication of applications eighteen months after filing. *See* 37 CFR 1.137(f).

The petition is **DISMISSED** as inappropriate for the reasons stated below.

The record discloses that, on January 11, 2001, the date of filing of the instant application, a Request and Certification under 35 U.S.C. § 122(b)(2)(B)(i) was filed certifying that "the invention disclosed in the attached **application has not and will not** be the subject of an application filed in another country, or under a multilateral international agreement, that requires publication at eighteen months after filing."

Petitioner now requests under 35 U.S.C. § 122(b)(2)(B)(ii) that the Request and Certification Under 35 U.S.C. § 122(b)(2)(B)(i) be rescinded and the application be revived because this application became abandoned for failure to notify the USPTO within 45 days of the filing of a corresponding international or foreign application. In this regard, petitioner states that an international or foreign application corresponding to the instant application was filed on October 13, 1999, which date is prior to the date of filing the instant application.

The instant nonprovisional application did not become abandoned as a result of the filing of a corresponding application filed in another country, or under a multilateral international agreement, **subsequent** to the filing of the present application. In this regard, 35 U.S.C. § 122((b)(2)(B)(iii) states:

An applicant who has made a request under clause (i) but who **subsequently files, in a foreign country or under a multilateral international agreement** specified in clause (i), an application directed to the invention disclosed in the application filed in the Patent and Trademark Office, shall notify the Director of such filing not later than 45 days **after the date of the filing of such foreign or international application**. A failure of the applicant to provide such notice within the prescribed period shall result in the application being regarded as abandoned, unless it is shown to the satisfaction of the Director that the delay in submitting the notice was unintentional.

The facts of this case are that the subject application was filed on January 11, 2001, and the corresponding foreign application was filed on October 13, 1999. The statute does not provide for the situation where a certification under 35 U.S.C. § 122(b)(2)(B)(i) was made, despite the fact that an application was previously filed in another country or under the multilateral international agreement. The provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 122(b)(2)(B)(iii) only provide for revival in the situation where a certification was made under 35 U.S.C. § 122(b)(2)(B)(i) at the time of filing the application and an application was subsequently filed in a foreign country without notifying the Office within 45 days of the filing thereof.

In view of the above and since this application did not become abandoned pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 122(b)(2)(B)(iii), a petition to revive under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) is inappropriate and, therefore, must be dismissed.

As requested, the Request and Certification Under 35 U.S.C. § 122(b)(2)(B)(i) has been rescinded. A Notice Regarding Rescission of Nonpublication Request indicating a projected publication date will be mailed in a separate correspondence.

The rules and statutory provisions governing the operations of the USPTO require payment of a fee on filing each petition. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 41(c)(7). Accordingly, the petition fee of \$1500 received on June 2, 2006 will not be refunded.

This application is being forwarded to Technology Center AU 2618 for examination in due course.

Any inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to Irvin Dingle at (571) 272-3210.



Irvin Dingle
Petition Examiner
Office of Petitions